12/14/87 U8960-2

ueber

Utah Economic and Business Review

Volume 47
Number 9
September 1987

BEBR

graduate school
of business
bureau of economic and
business research
university of utah

# IMMIGRATION AND THE UTAH ECONOMY

Garth Mangum and Gaylen Chandler*

The nation's growing dependence on immigration as a source of labor force growth is a matter of great concern -- fueled by the persistently below-replacement birth rates of recent years in the United States. That concern undoubtedly contributed to the structuring of the amnesty rules and the agricultural labor provisions of the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986.

Studies in California and other states have reached the conclusion that immigration has been a positive factor in economic development and job creation. Although many immigrants are not at the bottom of the skill ladder, a substantial proportion are. The availability of these productive but low paid workers is thought by a number of economists to aid business expansion, creating enough higher skilled jobs for U.S. nationals to compensate for those which are lost to immigrants. In that atmosphere, it appears useful to assess to the extent possible the impact of immigration on the Utah economy.

## A Rising Tide

From 1930 to 1970, immigration played a minor role in U.S. population growth. Then with changes in legislation in the 1960s, the aftermath of the war in Indochina and the persistent differentials in wages and employment opportunities between the United States and Latin America, the scene changed markedly. Just the legal immigration of 4.5 million people between 1970 and 1980 was the largest intercensal increase since 1930 and comprised nearly one-fifth of the population growth of the period. The number of illegal aliens in the U.S. is estimated to be between three and nine million. If one assumes that two million entered illegally during the 1970s, one-quarter of the population growth and one-third of the labor force growth in the nation would have been immigrants. The current population growth rates will not be known for certain until the 1990 census, but there is little reason to think the immigration component has slowed appreciably.

---

*Garth L. Mangum serves as Max McGraw Professor of Economics and Management at the University of Utah. Gaylen Chandler is a doctoral candidate in the Department of Management, Graduate School of Business.

Table 1

Distribution of the Foreign-Born Population by State Throughout the United States, 1980 (in thousands)

| State | Population of State (000) | Entering the Country 1970-1979 | In Country Before 1970 | Total Foreign-Born Population | Percent of Total[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 3,894 | 16 | 23 | 39 | 1.0 |
| Alaska | 402 | 6 | 10 | 16 | 4.0 |
| Arizona | 2,718 | 59 | 104 | 163 | 6.0 |
| Arkansas | 2,286 | 9 | 13 | 22 | 1.0 |
| California | 23,668 | 1,804 | 1,775 | 3,579 | 15.1 |
| Colorado | 2,890 | 47 | 67 | 114 | 3.9 |
| Connecticut | 3,108 | 66 | 202 | 268 | 8.6 |
| Delaware | 594 | 5 | 14 | 19 | 3.2 |
| Washington, D.C. | 638 | 21 | 20 | 41 | 6.4 |
| Florida | 9,746 | 326 | 732 | 1,058 | 10.9 |
| Georgia | 5,463 | 39 | 52 | 91 | 1.7 |
| Hawaii | 965 | 70 | 11 | 81 | 8.4 |
| Idaho | 944 | 9 | 14 | 23 | 2.4 |
| Illinois | 11,427 | 341 | 483 | 824 | 7.2 |
| Indiana | 5,490 | 33 | 69 | 102 | 1.9 |
| Iowa | 2,914 | 19 | 29 | 48 | 1.6 |
| Kansas | 2,364 | 23 | 25 | 48 | 2.0 |
| Kentucky | 3,661 | 15 | 20 | 35 | 1.0 |
| Louisiana | 4,206 | 40 | 45 | 85 | 2.0 |
| Maine | 1,125 | 6 | 37 | 43 | 3.8 |
| Maryland | 4,217 | 86 | 109 | 195 | 4.6 |
| Massachusetts | 5,737 | 144 | 357 | 501 | 8.7 |
| Michigan | 9,262 | 105 | 312 | 417 | 4.5 |
| Minnesota | 4,076 | 39 | 68 | 107 | 2.6 |
| Mississippi | 2,521 | 10 | 13 | 23 | .9 |
| Missouri | 4,917 | 29 | 56 | 85 | 1.7 |
| Montana | 787 | 4 | 15 | 19 | 2.4 |
| Nebraska | 1,570 | 11 | 20 | 31 | 2.0 |
| Nevada | 800 | 22 | 32 | 54 | 6.8 |
| New Hampshire | 921 | 6 | 35 | 41 | 4.5 |
| New Jersey | 7,365 | 255 | 502 | 757 | 10.3 |
| New Mexico | 1,303 | 23 | 29 | 52 | 4.0 |
| New York | 17,558 | 833 | 1,556 | 2,389 | 13.6 |
| North Carolina | 5,882 | 32 | 46 | 78 | 1.3 |
| North Dakota | 653 | 4 | 11 | 15 | 2.3 |
| Ohio | 10,798 | 73 | 229 | 302 | 2.8 |
| Oklahoma | 3,025 | 31 | 25 | 56 | 1.9 |
| Oregon | 2,633 | 40 | 67 | 107 | 4.1 |
| Pennsylvania | 11,864 | 99 | 302 | 401 | 3.4 |
| Rhode Island | 947 | 28 | 56 | 84 | 8.9 |
| South Carolina | 3,122 | 18 | 28 | 46 | 1.5 |
| South Dakota | 691 | 2 | 7 | 9 | 1.3 |
| Tennessee | 4,591 | 21 | 27 | 48 | 1.0 |
| Texas | 14,229 | 447 | 409 | 856 | 6.0 |
| Utah | 1,461 | 21 | 29 | 50 | 3.5 |
| Vermont | 511 | 4 | 17 | 21 | 4.1 |
| Virginia | 5,347 | 88 | 89 | 177 | 3.3 |
| Washington | 4,132 | 84 | 155 | 239 | 5.8 |
| West Virginia | 1,949 | 7 | 15 | 22 | 1.1 |
| Wisconsin | 4,705 | 31 | 94 | 125 | 2.7 |
| Wyoming | 470 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 2.1 |
| **Total** | 226,547 | 5,555 | 8,461 | 14,016 | 6.2 |

Source: Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Utah, (1980, Table 196).

[a]Density of foreign-born population. Foreign-born population divided by total population of the state.

## The Utah Share

Utah has not shared in that rate of immigration, however, legal or illegal. Utah's population as counted by the census grew from 1.06 million to 1.46 million, adding 400,000 during the 1970s. Of that, only 21,500 or 5 percent, were immigrants. Officials of the Immigration and Naturalization Service estimate that about 25,000 illegal aliens reside in the state, most of whom are believed to have arrived since 1970. About 10,000 of those are presumed to be eligible for legalization under the 1986 legislation. Of course, immigration to Utah and to the United States did not begin in 1970. Table 1 shows the foreign-born population by state and proportion separated between those entering the United States before and after 1970.

## Origins and Destinations

Seventy-two percent of all the increase in the foreign-born population in the U.S. was focused on six states: California, New York, Illinois, New Jersey, Florida and Texas. With those states excepted, Utah's 3.5 percent foreign born is about typical for the rest of the nation.

In Utah, as well as the balance of the country, the countries of foreign-born origin changed markedly about 1970. Historically, Europe had been the principal source. During the 1970s, 1.3 million of the total legal entrants to the United States were from Mexico and 900,000 from elsewhere in Central America. Whereas Asian immigration had been practically nonexistent for nearly 100 years, 1.8 million arrived from that part of the world during the 1970s, mostly from the Philippines, Korea and Vietnam. Of course, Mexico and Central America were the sources of the bulk of illegal entrants into the country.

For Utah, the pattern was quite different. Of the total of 50,451 foreign-born persons in the state, 21,573 arrived during the 1970s. Of those who came before 1970, 62 percent were Europeans, 20 percent Latin Americans and 7.2 percent Asians. In the post-1970 immigration, 13 percent were Europeans, 1 percent Mexicans, 5 percent Central and South Americans and 8.2 percent Canadians. A full 42 percent came from Asia, predominately from Vietnam, Laos, Thailand and Cambodia. Why Utah became the destination of so many more than its share of Indochinese immigrants is not readily apparent, but that fact has been important in determining their economic impact.

Just as foreign-born persons are not distributed evenly throughout the United States, neither are they distributed evenly throughout Utah. As can be seen in Table 2, the numerical majority are in Salt Lake County, which also has the highest percentage of foreign-born population in the state. The principal trend is a relatively higher density of the foreign-born population in metropolitan areas. However, both Carbon and Millard Counties are minor exceptions to this trend, consequent to mining and other major projects therein.

## Demographic Characteristics

The economic consequences of immigration differ substantially depending upon the demographic characteristics of the newcomers.

### Age

For most of the nation, the foreign born are younger than the national average. That is not true in Utah with its high birth rate and relatively young population. Of the total Utah population, 34 percent are under 15 years of age compared to 12 percent of the foreign born. At the other end of the scale, 18 percent of Utah's foreign born are over 65 years of age compared to only 8 percent of the native born. The result is a labor force anomaly: 65 percent of the native population over 16 years of age are labor force participants compared to 55 percent of the foreign born. Yet 48 percent of the foreign-born population -- 52 percent of the pre-1970 group and 42 percent of those arriving after 1970 -- are labor force participants compared to only 44 percent of the total native-born population. Because of this effect, the foreign born are 3.5 percent of Utah's population but 3.9 percent of its labor force.

### Sex

In the nation as a whole the immigrants are predominately male whereas in Utah the mix is about even for those who arrived after 1970. For the earlier arriving group, of course, the longer life expectancy of women tips the balance in their direction.

Table 2

Distribution of Foreign-Born Persons by County, Utah, 1980

| County | Europe | Asia | Canada | Mexico | Other | Foreign-Born Total | Pop. of County | Percent Foreign-Born |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Beaver | 25 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 5 | 53 | 4,378 | 1.2 |
| Box Elder | 246 | 92 | 65 | 189 | 48 | 640 | 33,222 | 1.9 |
| Cache | 496 | 917 | 156 | 43 | 460 | 2,072 | 57,176 | 3.6 |
| Carbon | 326 | 54 | 23 | 186 | 116 | 705 | 22,179 | 3.2 |
| Daggett | | | 2 | | 0 | 2 | 769 | .3 |
| Davis | 2,061 | 1,181 | 329 | 205 | 612 | 4,388 | 146,540 | 3.0 |
| Duchesne | 53 | 27 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 89 | 12,565 | .7 |
| Emery | 48 | 29 | 21 | 33 | 35 | 166 | 11,451 | 1.4 |
| Garfield | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 27 | 3,673 | .7 |
| Grand | 77 | | 33 | 8 | 13 | 131 | 8,241 | 1.6 |
| Iron | 87 | 56 | 32 | 56 | 9 | 240 | 17,349 | 1.4 |
| Juab | 49 | | 13 | 7 | 56 | 125 | 5,530 | 2.3 |
| Kane | 14 | 3 | 28 | | 4 | 49 | 4,024 | 1.2 |
| Millard | 41 | 142 | 22 | 57 | 56 | 318 | 8,970 | 3.5 |
| Morgan | 21 | | 2 | | 24 | 47 | 4,917 | 1.0 |
| Piute | | | | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1,329 | .2 |
| Rich | 4 | | 3 | 4 | 10 | 21 | 2,100 | 1.0 |
| Salt Lake | 12,674 | 6,243 | 2,004 | 1,986 | 5,033 | 27,940 | 619,066 | 4.5 |
| San Juan | 40 | 14 | 31 | 35 | 75 | 195 | 12,253 | 1.6 |
| Sanpete | 66 | 79 | 23 | 94 | 29 | 291 | 14,620 | 2.0 |
| Sevier | 60 | 6 | 27 | 15 | 14 | 122 | 14,727 | .8 |
| Summit | 72 | 11 | 43 | | 18 | 144 | 10,198 | 1.4 |
| Tooele | 312 | 45 | 26 | 121 | 51 | 555 | 26,033 | 2.1 |
| Uintah | 52 | 30 | 13 | | 11 | 106 | 20,506 | .5 |
| Utah | 1,509 | 1,089 | 1,771 | 690 | 1,847 | 6,906 | 218,106 | 3.2 |
| Wasatch | 53 | 5 | 20 | 8 | 27 | 113 | 8,523 | 1.3 |
| Washington | 204 | 65 | 87 | 74 | 78 | 508 | 26,065 | 1.9 |
| Wayne | 12 | 5 | 2 | | 0 | 19 | 1911 | 1.0 |
| Weber | 2,090 | 1,019 | 341 | 386 | 641 | 4,477 | 144,616 | 3.1 |
| Total | 20,697 | 11,126 | 5,132 | 4,221 | 9,275 | 50,451 | 1,461,037 | 3.5 |

Source: Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Utah, 1980, Table 238.

## Education

Educationally, the native-born population is homogeneous and the foreign-born more diverse. Only 1.3 percent of the native-born population over 25 years of age had four or less years of elementary school as compared to almost 10 percent of the foreign-born population that entered the U.S. between 1970 and 1980, and 5 percent of the foreign-born population that entered before 1970. On the other end of the spectrum, 15 percent of those who immigrated between 1970 and 1980 had five or more years of college, as compared to 9 percent for the native-born population and 8 percent for those foreign born who immigrated before 1970. At the time of the 1980 census, there were slightly more than 21,000 persons enumerated who said they had entered the country after 1970. Data from the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education showed that there were just less than 2,000 students registered as non-resident aliens in 1970. This number increased to just over 3,000 in 1979. Therefore, 3,000 of the 21,000 foreign-born persons who entered the U.S. after 1970 and were in Utah in 1979 were actually attending college, registered as non-resident aliens. This fact accounts for much of the diversity in educational attainment among the foreign born.

Over 80 percent of the native-born population 25 years of age and over have at least a high school diploma compared to 72 percent of the foreign-born population in the same age category. However, after having completed high school, foreign-born individuals were more likely to complete college and work for advanced degrees. The data shows that immigrants from Canada were significantly better educated than the native-born population. It should be noted, however, that a substantial proportion of the Canadian-born group came here to go to college.

Those who came from Mexico during the 1970s were significantly less well educated than the native born, with 45 percent not having completed high school, and 10 percent with four or more years of college. The foreign born from Asia showed more diversity with 31 percent not having completed high school, but also 29 percent with four or more years of college.

## Economic Status

The economic status of the pre- and post-1970 entrants also differs significantly.

## Income

There is little difference in personal income between the native population and the pre-1970 foreign-born entrants. However, the household income of the pre-1970 group suffers from their higher average age. Incomes are markedly lower for those who entered the U.S. during the 1970s. One reason for this is that the 3,000 nonresident alien students are forbidden to work as part of the terms of their visas (Table 3).

## Employment and Unemployment

As noted, the higher average age of the foreign born is one reason for their comparatively low household income. Since both immigrant groups have a higher number of 65 and older members and also because nonresident alien students are forbidden to work, they have more families without workers (Table 4). These factors, along with the smaller average family size of the post-1970 entrants, which limits the number of families with three or more workers, account for all of the significant differences.

In 1980, Utah had a 5.5 percent unemployment rate. This compares to a 7.5 percent rate for those foreign born who entered the country between 1970 and 1980. The rate was particularly high for Asian women who entered the country between 1975 and 1980, and also Mexican men who immigrated during the same time period. However, those who entered the country before 1970 had only a 3.1 percent unemployment rate.

Another significant factor in the income differentials is the stability of employment, once attained. Those foreign born in Utah who entered the U.S. before 1970 worked more weeks, more hours and had significantly less unemployed time during the year than the native-born labor force. Those who entered between 1970 and 1980 worked less weeks and hours with more unemployed time than those who were native born.

## Occupations

Again the occupational distribution of those who immigrated to Utah before 1970 differs little from the native born (Table 5). The 1970s immigrants are substantially lower on the occupational scale, though there is a high proportion in the

Table 3

Household Income Compared for Native-Born
vs. Foreign-Born Groups
(percent)

| 1979 Income | Native | 1970-79 Immigrants | Pre-1970 Immigrants |
|---|---|---|---|
| Less than $5,000 | 9.5 | 24.0 | 15.0 |
| $5,000-$7,499 | 7.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| $7,500-$9,999 | 7.5 | 10.0 | 9.0 |
| $10,000-$14,999 | 16.0 | 17.0 | 15.0 |
| $15,000-$19,999 | 16.0 | 15.0 | 14.0 |
| $20,000-$24,999 | 15.0 | 8.0 | 12.0 |
| $25,000-$34,999 | 17.0 | 7.0 | 14.0 |
| $35,000-$50,000 | 8.4 | 3.5 | 7.5 |
| More than $50,000 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| Median | $17,858 | $11,057 | $14,824 |
| Mean | $20,474 | $14,062 | $17,904 |

Source: Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Utah, 1980, Table 196.

Table 4

Number of Workers per Family, Native-born Population
Compared to Foreign-born Population
(percent)

| Number of Workers | Native | 1970-1979 Immigrants | Pre-19790 Immigrants |
|---|---|---|---|
| None | 8.4 | 11.8 | 18.0 |
| 1 | 34.0 | 36.0 | 33.0 |
| 2 | 44.0 | 43.0 | 36.0 |
| 3 or more | 13.7 | 9.5 | 13.0 |
| Mean | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.5 |

Source: Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Utah, 1980, Table 196.

Table 5

Occupational Comparisons of Native-born vs. Foreign-born Workers, 1980

| | Native Born | Percent[a] | 1970-79 Immi-grants | Percent[a] | Pre-1970 Immi-grants | Percent[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Managerial and Professional Specialty Occupations | 133,794 | 24 | 1,858 | 23 | 3,843 | 27 |
| Technical, Sales and Admin. Support Occupations | 173,080 | 31 | 1,440 | 17 | 3,968 | 28 |
| Service Occupations | 67,391 | 12 | 1,605 | 19 | 2,198 | 15 |
| Farming, Forestry and Fishing Occupations | 12,433 | 2 | 256 | 3 | 254 | 2 |
| Precision Production, Craft and Repair Occupations | 86,302 | 15 | 899 | 11 | 1,976 | 14 |
| Operators, Fabricators and Laborers | 90,386 | 16 | 2,197 | 27 | 2,041 | 14 |
| Total | 563,386 | 100 | 8,255 | 100 | 14,280 | 100 |

Source: Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Utah, 1980, Table 196.

[a]Total number of workers in each occupation divided by total of native born, immigrated 1970-1979, and immigrated before 1970 respectively.

managerial and professional category. Despite the perception that an inordinate proportion of the recent immigrants are involved in small businesses, only 3.1 percent of the 1970-80 foreign born are self employed compared to 6.2 percent of the native population and 7.1 percent of the pre-1970 foreign born.

Economic Impact of Utah's Immigrants

The 1986 immigration legislation was a compromise between those fearful that the immigrants were taking jobs and income from U.S. nationals while imposing undue burdens on the welfare and education system, and those relying upon immigrants as major proportions of their work force. Little is known about the relative costs and benefits to the economy, particularly in Utah, but some speculation is possible based on studies in other states.

Do Immigrants Take Jobs from Native Workers?

The issue is whether aliens are substitutes or complements for U.S. workers. Are there only so many jobs so that every hire of a foreign born equals one less native born hired? Are there jobs that U.S. workers will not do at wages employers can afford to pay so that each low-paid hire of an alien is a net increase in employment? Does the increase in residents increase the demand for goods and services and, therefore, the total amount of employment? Does an increase in the supply of low paid jobs filled by immigrants increase the demand for managerial, supervisory, technical and skilled jobs to support the unskilled ones? Studies in Texas have found no significant correlation between the presence of Mexican workers and the local unemployment level. California studies have been able to identify no negative effects of immigration on the employment of non-immigrants in those labor markets. Since California has been able to identify no net job loss despite the absorption of two million legal and an unknown number of illegal immigrants during the last decade, it is assumed that no negative effects would be found in Utah. Positive impacts would be even more difficult to prove.

Do Immigrants Depress Wage Rates?

The relationship between immigration and wages is extremely complex, because those effects would

vary considerably across different sectors of the labor market. It is common in the literature to segment the labor market into primary and secondary markets. The immigrant population in Utah is more heavily weighted toward the laborer's sector of the labor market, and would be expected to have the greatest effect there. Many hold jobs at the lower end of the "primary" market, which would include low skilled workers in the major industries. Others, however, hold jobs in the secondary market where there is little hope for advancement, no wage regulation (except minimum wage) and no job security. There is little evidence that employers violate wage regulations in the hiring of alien workers, even those who are in the country illegally. In 1982 almost 90 percent of undocumented workers sampled by the Immigration and Naturalization Service earned minimum wage or more.

The evidence suggests that there is in fact some decrease in wages because of immigration. Muller and Espenshade (1985) concluded that the presence of Mexicans and other immigrant groups reduces the average wage paid in manufacturing and some services in California. This reduction primarily reflects the increasing share of Hispanics in the work force, since the wage rate for Hispanics is typically lower than for non-Hispanics in similar occupations. They also concluded that the presence of immigrants had somewhat depressed the wages for non-Hispanics working as laborers, but that the effects of immigrants on the wages for semi-skilled and skilled laborers appeared to be negligible. Although there may be some discrimination, the principal reasons why immigrants received lower wages are that they are less likely to be unionized and they have less experience and education than other workers. Thus, in Utah, the influx of Southeast Asians has probably had a slight dampening effect on wages in the low-skill sectors.

That impact will differ significantly by occupations and industry. Of the post-1970 immigrants into Utah, 23 percent are professionals. Studies have found no negative impacts on income in the professional class. Therefore, it will be assumed that there is no negative impact for the professional group. The remainder of the more recent immigrants is most heavily concentrated in service and labor occupations. The labor intensive industries are most likely to employ immigrants at relatively low wage rates. The influx of alien workers has slightly depressed the wage rates in those industries. Substantial numbers of the recent immigrants, legal and illegal, are employed in hotels, motels, restaurants, landscaping and agriculture. Another significant portion are employed as laborers and assemblers in manufacturing industries. The past effects in these industries have been to depress the wage paid, and therefore the cost of goods and services. However, in Utah, there is such a small proportion of immigrants in the work force, that any depression of wages would be minimal. Those businesses with local markets are likely to be affected only slightly, since all other businesses in the same markets (hotels, restaurants, landscaping, etc.) will be affected in the same way and no significant advantage or disadvantage would accrue to any. Therefore, the new immigration bill, legalizing some aliens and imposing penalties for hiring those not legalized, will have very little long-term effect on these businesses and industries.

## Competitive Consequences

Those manufacturers who employ large quantities of recent immigrants as operators, fabricators and laborers gain an advantage in the price of labor. Those companies who compete on a regional, national or international basis would be more competitive with a large part of the labor force being recent immigrants. Utah has such a small proportion (only 2.4 percent of the people employed in these occupations are immigrants), of the labor force being recent immigrants, that there are very minimal benefits to businesses in Utah. Since it is concluded that immigrant labor has not created a significant competitive advantage for businesses in Utah, the change in the immigration law will have very little effect on Utah's economy. If anything, the increase in wages in areas of the country where there have been sizeable populations of immigrants, will create positive benefits for labor intensive industries in Utah.

## Labor Shortages?

Illegal aliens have played a significant role in the harvest of Utah's fruit crops. The current legislation attempts to continue to allow this group of workers to function. In June there was a feared shortage of pickers for the cherry crop in Utah. However, there is no indication that any of the crop was lost for that reason. That is in contrast to Oregon where a shortage of strawberry pickers caused the loss of one-third of the $30 million

strawberry harvest. There was sufficient impact in Utah's labor supply to cause some upward pressure on wages. The pressure on wages has also been applicable to fruit growers in other parts of the country, and therefore, should not reduce the chance for fruit growers in Utah to remain competitive.

Fiscal Impacts

Foreign-born persons are both taxpayers and consumers of public services. How does the balance between taxpaying and service receiving compare for the native born and foreign born?

Table 6 provides some estimates for per capita payment of taxes. On a per capita basis, Utahns contributed 68 percent of the national average toward federal income taxes. Therefore, it is estimated that of $581 million in intergovernmental transfer payments from the federal government to state and local governments, 68 percent or $395 million came from Utah taxpayers. Estimates of foreign-born contributions were derived by dividing household income by the number of persons per household in each foreign-born group to establish per capita income, then multiplying the ratio of per capita foreign-born income to per capita total income by the average per capita taxes paid. This is considered to be a rough estimate, and is intended to give some idea of the relative contributions of the represented groups.

Table 7 provides estimates for the costs of benefits used, and Tables 6 and 7 are not directly comparable. Estimates for both foreign-born groups on education through high school were derived by multiplying the ratio of foreign-born persons aged 5-19 to the total number of persons in each respective group by the average for the total population in the first column. The cost of higher education for the pre-1970 entrants was determined simply by comparing ages of persons aged 20-34 with the total population. The age distribution for those age groups is very similar. Other analysis has suggested that the pre-1970 group is very similar to the total population in all aspects except for the age distribution. It is not likely that these students would be listed as "foreign students," because of the length of time they have been in the U.S. Since the age distribution is similar, the cost of education is concluded to also be very similar.

Approximately 3,000 students were listed as foreign-born attending Utah universities in the 1979-80 school year. However, only about two-thirds of these students were enrolled in state-funded institutions. Approximately 50,000 students were enrolled in state-funded institutions, or about 3.5 percent of

Table 6

Estimates for Taxes Contributed
by the Foreign-Born Population of Utah

| | Revenue Received (millions) | Average per Capita Taxes Paid[b] | Average per Capita Contributions by Pre-1970 Entrants[c] | Average per Capita Contributions by 1970-1980 Entrants[c] |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| From Federal Government[a] | $395 | $281 | $370 | $207 |
| Property Tax | 343 | 243 | 321 | 179 |
| General Sales Tax | 396 | 280 | 369 | 206 |
| State Income Tax | 306 | 217 | 170 | 95 |
| Other | 183 | 129 | 286 | 159 |
| Total | $1,583 | $1,150 | $1,516 | $ 846 |

Source: Revenue Received--Bureau of the Census, Governmental Finances, GF80, 1970-80, Table 5.

[a]Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1986, Table 516.
[b]Revenue received/total population.
[c]Bureau of the Census, General Social and Economic Characteristics, Utah, 1980, Table 196.

Table 7

Average per Capita Costs of Benefits for the Total Population, Pre-1970 Foreign-Born Entrants, and 1970-1980 Foreign-Born Entrants

| | Total Population[a] | Pre-1970 Entrants | 1970-1980 Entrants |
|---|---|---|---|
| Education Through High School[b] | $ 479 | $ 75 | $ 482 |
| Higher Education[c] | 236 | 236 | 472 |
| Public Welfare, High Estimate | 129 | 129 | 129 |
| Hospitals | 102 | 102 | 102 |
| Highways | 191 | 191 | 191 |
| Police | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Fire | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Interest on Debt | 50 | 50 | 50 |
| Other | 357 | 357 | 357 |
| Total | $1,614 | $1,200 | $1,1853 |

[a]Bureau of the Census, Governmental Finances. GF80, No. 5, 1980, Table 24.

[b]Age data: Bureau of the Census, Selected Social and Economic Characteristics, Utah, 1980, Table 196.

[c]Source of enrollment data: Utah State Board of Higher Education, Annual Report to the Governor and Legislature, "Planning and Enrollment," 1979-1980, Tables 3 and 5.

the total population of the state. On the other hand, about 10 percent of all recent foreign-born entrants to the state were students in state-funded universities. Many of these students are teaching assistants, teaching classes in technical fields at a comparatively low wage rate. The initial data suggest that if the 1970-1980 entrants were footing the entire bill, the cost for them per capita would be almost triple. Since no data is available to suggest the dollar value of benefits received from foreign students, the figure for per capita costs of benefits for the foreign born in higher education has been estimated at double the state average. This is a somewhat arbitrary estimate, and little more than a guess. However, the estimate does give some idea of the possible costs.

New entrants pay fewer taxes than the native population and the pre-1970 immigrants. The pre-1970 immigrants, however, pay more taxes per capita. The estimates may be biased upward for the pre-1970 immigrants because their native-born children are counted as native-born citizens, and this estimating procedure deals with per capita rather than household or family income. If the native children of immigrants were also counted in the immigrant group, it would cause the per capita income to decrease, and thus the per capita taxes. Nevertheless, these calculations provide a reasonable estimate of the comparative tax contribution of immigrants.

The perception that foreign-born persons are heavy users of welfare is not supported by survey data or service provider reports (Table 7). Studies show that recent immigrants receive substantially less in public welfare than comparable low income populations. One hypothesis is that recent immigrants do not know what is available, nor how to work the system. Service provider reports estimate the costs of providing services to persons whose birthplace and legal status are undetermined. Therefore, it is concluded that actual welfare use by

Utah immigrants is somewhere between substantially below and no more than that of the general population in the same income range.

There are no data to document the use of hospitals, highways, police or interest on state debt; therefore they are assumed to be used at the same rate by immigrants as by the general population.

It is concluded that recent entrants use more public services than they pay for in taxes. However, most of the unpaid-for services being used are in education. After being in the country for several years, immigrants in Utah contribute substantially more in taxes than they receive in services. A serious problem will arise only when sharp increases in the inflow of foreign born outweigh the contributions of those foreign born who have been in the state for some time. Although recent immigrants do consume more in state services than they contribute in taxes, the difference is not great and would not have a major negative fiscal impact.

However, this conclusion is reached only on the basis of legal immigrants for whom there are data. It does not include impacts of illegal aliens. The literature suggests that illegal aliens are typically young males who have taxes withheld, but consume very few services. INS estimates that there may be 25,000 illegal aliens in the state. However, fewer than one thousand (as of August 1987) have come forward to claim legal status under the amnesty provision of the 1986 immigration legislation. Whatever the numbers, it would be expected that illegal aliens contribute substantially more in taxes than they receive in services.

Summary

In summary, the foreign-born population of Utah increased dramatically during the 1970s. Labor market characteristics of pre-1970 immigrants are very similar to the native-born population. There are appreciable differences, however, between the native-born population and the more recent entrants. The age distribution of those who entered the country between 1970 and 1980 is more heavily weighted in the prime working years than the distribution of the native-born population. As a result, even though in Utah immigrants had a slightly lower labor force participation rate than the native born, they accounted for 3.9 percent of the labor force and only 3.5 percent of the population.

Recent entrants, on the one hand, were more likely to have four or more years of college than the native-born population. On the other hand, they were also more likely to have less than a high school education.

The characteristics of high educational achievement for a large proportion of the recent entrants to the country place that group typically in professional and skilled occupations where no wage dampening effects have been encountered. However, because many immigrants are poorly educated, they work in unskilled jobs where their presence may have some downward impact on the overall level of wages paid in that sector of the labor market. That effect would be minimized by the relatively small proportion of immigrants in the population.

Persons who legally entered the country recently use more in state-financed services than they provide in tax revenues. However, those who have been here for some time provide more in taxes than they consume in benefits. The illegal immigrants probably pay substantially more in taxes than they use in public services. After being in the state for a period of several years, Utah's immigrants assume demographic and economic characteristics very similar to the native-born population. At Utah's modest rate of immigration there is no evidence of substantial negative impact. Bringing with them a new set of experiences and the willingness to work productively for modest pay, Utah, on balance, appears to benefit substantially from its new arrivals.

Bibliography


Borjas, George J. "The Labor Supply of Male Hispanic Immigrants in the United States." International Migration Review, 1983, 17(4), pp. 653-71.

Briggs, Vernon M., Jr. "Mexican Workers in the United States Labor Market: A Contemporary Dilemma." International Labor Review, Nov. 1975b, 112(15), pp. 351-68.

Briggs, Vernon M., Jr. and Tienda, Marta. Immigration Issues and Policies. Salt Lake City, Utah: Olympus Publishing Company, 1985.

Chiswick, Barry R. "A Longitudinal Analysis of the Occupational Mobility of Immigrants." In Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual Winter Meeting, Barbara D. Dennis, Ed., Madison, Wisconsin: IRRA, 1978C, pp. 20-27.

Emerson, Michael D. Seasonal Agricultural Labor Markets in the United States. Iowa State University Press, 1984.

"Fall Enrollment Report of Utah School Districts." Utah State Office of Education, October 1, 1986, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Chiswick, Barry R. "The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-Born Men." Journal of Political Economy, Vol. 86, No. 51, 1978, pp. 897-921.

Community Research Associates. "Undocumented Immigrants: Their Impact on the County of Los Angles." Report prepared for the County of Los Angeles, Community Research Associates, San Diego, California, May 1980.

Greenwood, Michael J. and McDowell, John M. "The Factor Market Consequences of U.S. Immigration." Journal of Economic Literature, Vol. XXIV, December 1986, pp. 1738-72.

Killingsworth, Mark R. Effects of Immigration into the United States on the U.S. Labor Market: Analytical and Policy Issues. Mary M. Kritz, ed., Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1982, pp. 249-68.

_____. Labor Supply. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

McCarthy, Kevin F. and Valdez, R. Burciaga. Current and Future Effects of Mexican Immigration in California. Rand Corporation, Santa Monica, California, 1986.

Muller, Thomas and Espenshade, Thomas J. The Fourth Wave: California's Newest Immigrants. The Urban Institute Press, Washington, D.C., 1985.

North, David S. "Impacts of Legal, Illegal, and Refugee Migrations on U.S. Social Services Programs." In U.S. Immigration and Refugee Policy: Global and Domestic Issues. Ed., Mary M. Kritz, Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1982, pp. 269-85.

North, David S. and Houstoun, Marion F. The Characteristics and Role of Illegal Aliens in the U.S. Labor Market: An Exploratory Study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Labor, March 1976.

Piore, Michael J. Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Pozo, Susan. "Essays on Legal and Illegal Immigration." Paper presented in a seminar series conducted by the Department of Economics at Western Michigan University, W. E. Upjohn Institute of Employment, 1986.

Rivera-Batiz, Francisco L. "Trade Theory, Distribution of Income and Immigration." American Economic Review, May 1983, Vol. 73 No. 2, pp. 83-87.

"Rotten Shame: Who Will Pick the Crops?" Time, Vol. 129, June 22, 1987, pg. 49.

Siegel, Jacob S., Passel, Jeffrey S. and Robinson, J. Gregory. "Preliminary Review of Existing Studies of the Number of Illegal Residents in the United States." In U.S. Immigration Policy and the National Interest. Appendix E to the Staff Report of the Select Commission on Immigration and Refugee Policy: Papers on Illegal Immigration to the U.S. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981, pp. 13-39.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1980 Census of Population: General Social and Economic Characteristics. Part 1, U.S. Summary, PC80-1-C1. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983, 1984.

_____. 1980 Census of Population: General Social and Economic Characteristics, Utah. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1983, 1984.

_____. Government Finances in 1984-85. Series GF85, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1986, Table 29.

Villapando, M.V. A Study of the Impact of Illegal Aliens on the County of San Diego on Specific Socioeconomic Areas. San Diego County Human Resources Agency, San Diego, California, 1977.

Weintraub, Sidney and Ross, Stanley R. Temporary Alien Workers in the United States: Designing Policy from Fact and Fiction. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1982.

# Utah Business Statistics

| UTAH DATA | June 1986 | June 1987 | % Change From Year Ago | 12 Month Average This Year | 12 Month Average Last Year | 12 Month Average % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Personal Income (seasonally adjusted) (mil. of dol.) (qtly.) | 17,879 | NA | NA | NA | 17,633.8 | NA |
| New Corporations (no.) | 445 | 507 | 13.9% | 453 | 454 | -0.3% |
| New Car, Truck and Motorhome Sales (no.) | 6,037 | NA | NA | NA | 6,295 | NA |
| **Agriculture** | | | | | | |
| Average Prices Recorded by Farmers (dol.) | | | | | | |
| Beef Steers and Heifers (cwt) (thous.) | 51.00 | 66.50 | 30.4% | 60.03 | 53.68 | 11.8% |
| Lambs (cwt) | 69.40 | 76.80 | 10.7% | 70.10 | 64.99 | 7.9% |
| Milk Wholesale (cwt) | 11.20 | 11.40 | 1.8% | 12.01 | 11.63 | 3.2% |
| Alfalfa Hay, Baled (per ton) | 71.00 | 69.00 | -2.8% | 64.25 | 71.06 | -9.6% |
| Cattle Slaughtered (live weight) (thous. of lbs.) | 37,409 | 39,501 | 5.6% | 39,261 | 35,212 | 11.5% |
| **Construction** | | | | | | |
| Total Construction (thous. of dol.) [1] | 244,093 | 210,246 | -13.9% | 123,912 | 140,747 | -12.0% |
| Residential | 75,317 | 66,920 | -11.1% | 58,311 | 60,516 | -3.6% |
| Nonresidential | 139,490 | 56,391 | -59.6% | 38,644 | 51,505 | -25.0% |
| Public Works and Utilities | 29,286 | 86,935 | 196.8% | 26,957 | 28,968 | -6.9% |
| Total Permit Construction (thous. of dol.) [2] | 146,093.8 | 95,014.8 | -35.0% | 101,190.7 | 124,259.9 | -18.6% |
| Residential | 76,895.5 | 50,311.4 | -34.5% | 52,560.4 | 62,047.0 | -15.3% |
| Nonresidential | 50,827.3 | 27,991.5 | -44.9% | 35,322.3 | 47,748.5 | -26.0% |
| Additions, Alterations and Repairs | 18,653.4 | 16,711.9 | -10.4% | 13,305.0 | 13,987.9 | -4.9% |
| New Dwelling Units (no.) | 1,734 | 727 | -58.1% | 857 | 1,272 | -32.6% |
| **Employment** | | | | | | |
| Civilian Labor Force (thous.) | 750.8 | 761.6 | 1.4% | 762.6 | 752.2 | 1.4% |
| Total Employed Persons | 707.0 | 712.3 | 0.7% | 714.4 | 709.6 | 0.7% |
| Unemployed Persons | 40.9 | 49.3 | 20.5% | 48.2 | 42.2 | 14.2% |
| Percent Total Labor Force | 5.5 | 6.5 | 18.2% | 6.3 | 5.6 | 13.3% |
| Employees on Nonagricultural Payrolls (thous. of jobs) | 636.5 | 643.2 | 1.1% | 637.7 | 632.0 | 0.9% |
| Manufacturing | 93.0 | 93.6 | 0.6% | 91.4 | 94.0 | -2.9% |
| Mining | 7.8 | 8.1 | 3.8% | 8.2 | 8.8 | -7.6% |
| Contract Construction | 35.6 | 29.6 | -16.9% | 31.1 | 35.4 | -12.2% |
| Transportaion, Communication and Utilities | 37.2 | 37.9 | 1.9% | 37.6 | 37.0 | 1.7% |
| Wholesale Trade | 36.1 | 36.5 | 1.1% | 36.2 | 35.8 | 1.0% |
| Retail Trade | 116.3 | 119.5 | 2.8% | 118.4 | 114.7 | 3.3% |
| Finance, Insurance and Real Estate | 33.1 | 34.2 | 3.3% | 33.5 | 32.0 | 4.6% |
| Services [3] | 136.2 | 143.2 | 5.1% | 140.3 | 134.7 | 4.1% |
| Federal Government [4] | 40.8 | 39.8 | -2.5% | 40.4 | 40.0 | 1.1% |
| State Government [4] | 37.7 | 36.5 | -3.2% | 37.7 | 36.8 | 2.3% |
| Local Government [4] | 62.7 | 64.4 | 2.7% | 63.9 | 62.8 | 1.8% |
| Average Weekly Hours | | | | | | |
| Manufacturing | 39.8 | 39.8 | 0.0% | 39.7 | 40.4 | -1.7% |
| Mining | 40.8 | 40.0 | -2.0% | 42.7 | 44.3 | -3.7% |
| Wholesale Trade | 37.3 | 38.8 | 4.0% | 37.7 | 35.7 | 5.8% |
| Retail Trade | 28.6 | 28.8 | 0.7% | 28.3 | 28.1 | 0.8% |
| Amount of Unemployment Compensation (thous. of dol.) | 6,825.1 | 7,375.1 | 8.1% | 8,890.9 | 7,640.8 | 16.4% |
| **Finance** | | | | | | |
| Savings, Savings and Loan Association (mil. of dol.) | 2,361.4 | 2,476.5 | 4.9% | 2,425.7 | 2,347.6 | 3.3% |
| Tax Collections by the State of Utah (thous. of dol.) | | | | | | |
| Total Tax Collections | 122,472.5 | 156,747.8 | 28.0% | 129,531.1 | 125,093.1 | 3.5% |
| Sales and Use Tax | 56,912.1 | 62,358.9 | 9.6% | 46,542.8 | 45,246.2 | 2.9% |
| Motor Fuel Tax | 9,860.6 | 14,960.3 | 51.7% | 8,331.8 | 7,680.3 | 8.5% |
| Individual Income Tax | 30,044.0 | 33,916.5 | 12.9% | 44,421.1 | 37,628.5 | 18.1% |
| Corporation Franchise Tax | 508.3 | 11,481.2 | 2158.7% | 5,073.9 | 5,622.2 | -9.8% |
| **Production** | | | | | | |
| Net Electric Power Utilized (mil. of kwh) | 1,108.6 | 1,135.0 | 2.4% | 1,112.6 | 1,117.3 | -0.4% |
| Crude Oil to Refineries (thous. of bbls.) | 3,921.3 | 3,804.9 | -3.0% | 3,918.3 | 3,704.9 | 5.8% |
| Crude Oil (thous. of bbls.) | 2,926.0 | 2,896.1 | -1.0% | 3,045.3 | 3,465.9 | -12.1% |
| Natural Gas (mil. of cu. ft.) | 17,535.9 | 19,950.6 | 13.8% | 20,176.0 | 18,770.9 | 7.5% |
| Coal (thous. short tons) | 1,060.0 | 1,187.0 | 12.0% | 924.6 | 1,086.7 | -14.9% |
| **Tourism/Travel** | | | | | | |
| Air Passengers (total no. on and off) (S.L. Int'l Airport) | 897,797 | 913,902 | 1.8% | 833,420 | 786,043 | 6.0% |
| Highway Traffic Count Across State Lines | 45,298 | 48,264 | 6.5% | 38,146 | 34,976 | 9.1% |
| Transient Room Taxes (thous. of dol.) | 1,016.3 | 582.5 | -42.7% | 437.2 | 463.8 | -5.7% |
| Visits, State, Nat'l. Parks, Monuments (thous.) | 1,733.4 | 1,977.6 | 14.1% | 1,031.1 | 956.5 | 7.8% |
| **Utilities** | | | | | | |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell) (Residential) | 468,349 | 477,221 | 1.9% | 476,240 | 467,144 | 1.9% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential) | 167,803 | 175,281 | 4.5% | 172,214 | 166,418 | 3.5% |
| Electric Customers (Residential). | 459,233 | 467,881 | 1.9% | 467,341 | NA | NA |
| Electric Customers (Commercial) | 45,117 | 46,273 | 2.6% | 45,912 | NA | NA |
| Natural Gas Customers (Residential & Commercial) | 433,460 | 443,654 | 2.4% | 441,393 | 429,167 | 2.8% |
| Natural Gas Customers (Industrial) | 564 | 556 | -1.4% | 563 | 569 | -1.2% |

# Utah Business Statistics

| UTAH DATA | June 1986 | June 1987 | % Change From Year Ago | 12 Month Average This Year | 12 Month Average Last Year | 12 Month Average % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Davis County** | | | | | | |
| Non-Ag. Employment (thous.) | 54.0[r] | 54.4[fo] | 0.7% | 53.1 | 53.1 | 0.0% |
| Unemployment Rate | 4.5[r] | 5.6 | 24.4% | 5.0 | 3.9 | 27.4% |
| Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.) | 27,750.0 | 12,728.7 | -54.1% | 15,104.1 | 16,345.6 | -7.6% |
| New Dwelling Units (no.) | 580 | 120 | -79.3% | 141 | 236 | -40.2% |
| Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.) | 330.1 | 347.4 | 5.2% | NA | 322.6 | NA |
| Electric Customers (Residential) | 44,843 | 47,121 | 5.1% | 46,365 | 38,974 | 19.0% |
| Electric Customers (Commercial) | 3,277 | 3,271 | -0.2% | 3,265 | 2,879 | 13.4% |
| Natural Gas Customers (Residential) | 46,153 | 48,677 | 5.5% | 47,736 | 45,209 | 5.6% |
| Natural Gas Customers (Industrial) | 50 | 86 | 72.0% | 55 | 50 | 8.1% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential) | 52,955 | 54,959 | 3.8% | 54,155 | 51,230 | 5.7% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential) | 10,123 | 10,575 | 4.5% | 10,321 | 9,847 | 4.8% |
| **Salt Lake County** | | | | | | |
| Non-Ag. Employment (thous.) | 331.9[r] | 338.0[fo] | 1.8% | 335.2 | 328.2 | 2.1% |
| Unemployment Rate | 5.2[r] | 5.6 | 7.7% | 5.5 | 5.6 | -1.5% |
| Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.) | 75,616.3 | 43,610.0 | -42.3% | 48,835.5 | 64,781.9 | -24.6% |
| New Dwelling Units (no.) | 688 | 274 | -60.2% | 374 | 562 | -33.4% |
| Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.) | 7,116.9 | 6,786.3 | -4.6% | 7,056.1 | 7,398.3 | -4.6% |
| Electric Customers (Residential) | 229,986 | 234,279 | 1.9% | 234,064 | 227,603 | 2.8% |
| Electric Customers (Commercial) | 19,264 | 19,792 | 2.7% | 19,641 | 18,918 | 3.8% |
| Natural Gas Customers (Residential) | 211,694 | 216,415 | 2.2% | 215,413 | 209,087 | 3.0% |
| Natural Gas Customers (Industrial) | 258 | 241 | -6.6% | 249 | 259 | -3.7% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential) | 221,901 | 226,229 | 2.0% | 224,943 | 219,852 | 2.3% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential) | 107,632 | 109,682 | 1.9% | 108,950 | 107,091 | 1.7% |
| **Utah County** | | | | | | |
| Non-Ag. Employment (thous.) | 71.1[r] | 71.0[fo] | -0.1% | 71.2 | 71.5 | -0.4% |
| Unemployment Rate | 5.6[r] | 7.1 | 26.8% | 7.3 | 6.1 | 20.0% |
| Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.) | 13,799.9 | 13,321.5 | -3.5% | 11,185.9 | 10,712.2 | 4.4% |
| New Dwelling Units (no.) | 162 | 96 | -40.7% | 102 | 98 | 4.2% |
| Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.) | 854.4 | 903.0 | 5.7% | 927.8 | 917.1 | 1.2% |
| Electric Customers (Residential) | 49,310 | 50,225 | 1.9% | 50,247 | NA | NA |
| Electric Customers (Commercial) | 6,189 | 6,587 | 6.4% | 6,330 | NA | NA |
| Natural Gas Customers (Residential) | 59,080 | 59,591 | 0.9% | 59,996 | 59,043 | 1.6% |
| Natural Gas Customers (Industrial) | 73 | 68 | -6.8% | 72 | 71 | 2.1% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential) | 60,141 | 61,134 | 1.7% | 62,300 | 61,642 | 1.1% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential) | 15,825 | 18,459 | 16.6% | 17,287 | 15,349 | 12.6% |
| **Weber County** | | | | | | |
| Non-Ag. Employment (thous.) | 60.0[r] | 60.9[fo] | 1.5% | 59.8 | 58.5 | 2.3% |
| Unemployment Rate | 6.5[r] | 7.7 | 18.5% | 6.8 | 5.5 | 22.1% |
| Auth. Permit Construction (thous. of dol.) | 7,603.0 | 9,470.0 | 24.6% | 9,319.5 | 8,626.8 | 8.0% |
| New Dwelling Units (no.) | 87 | 69 | -20.7% | 73 | 95 | -23.7% |
| Postal Receipts (thous. of dol.) | 544.2 | 605.1 | 11.2% | 625.0 | 604.1 | 3.5% |
| Electric Customers (Residential) | 51,519 | 52,615 | 2.1% | 52,392 | 51,203 | 2.3% |
| Electric Customers (Commercial) | 4,714 | 4,840 | 2.7% | 4,788 | 4,696 | 2.0% |
| Natural Gas Customers (Residential) | 47,812 | 48,582 | 1.6% | 48,640 | 47,465 | 2.5% |
| Natural Gas Customers (Industrial) | 87 | 86 | -1.1% | 88 | 87 | -1.3% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Residential) | 45,367 | 45,935 | 1.3% | 45,675 | 45,215 | 1.0% |
| Telephone Lines in Service (Mt. Bell)(Nonresidential) | 10,498 | 10,999 | 4.8% | 10,713 | 10,514 | 1.9% |

[r] Revised [na] Not available [fo] Forecast

Sources:

| | |
|---|---|
| Personal Income: | Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce |
| New Corporations: | Utah Secretary of State |
| New Car and Truck Sales: | Utah State Tax Commission, Economic and Statistical Unit |
| Agriculture: | U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agriculture, Utah: Utah Crop and Livestock Reporting Service |
| Construction Data: | F.W. Dodge Statistics and Utah Construction Report, Bureau of Economic and Business Research |
| Employment Data: | Utah Department of Employment Security |
| Savings Information: | Utah Savings and Loan Institutions |
| Tax Collections: | Utah State Tax Commission |
| Net Electric Power Utilized: | Cooperating Utah power companies |
| Crude Oil Production: | Area oil refineries |
| Natural Gas Production: | Utah Department of Oil, Gas, and Mining |
| Coal Production: | U.S. Department of Energy |
| Air Passengers: | Salt Lake City International Airport, Statistics Division |
| Highway Traffic Count: | Utah Department of Transportation |
| Visits to State and National Parks and Monuments: | U. S. Forest Service, Utah State Parks and Recreation Department |
| Utilities Data: | Cooperating Utah utility companies |
| Postal Receipts: | Postmasters in Davis, Salt Lake, Utah, and Weber Counties |

Footnotes:

1 Obtained from F.W. Dodge Statistics
2 Obtained from Utah Construction Report
3 Includes services by nonprofit and religious institutions
4 Includes public schools and college institutions

**Bureau of Economic and Business Research**
**University of Utah**
**Salt Lake City, Utah 84112**
**Return Postage Guaranteed**
**(Non-Profit Organization)**

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage Paid

Permit No. 1529
Salt Lake City, Utah

SRI ACQUISITION
CONGRESSIONAL
INFORMATION SERVICE, INC.
4520 EAST WEST HIGHWAY
BETHESDA, MARYLAND 20814

| NATIONAL DATA | June 1986 | June 1987 | % Change From Year Ago | 12 Month Average This Year | 12 Month Average Last Year | 12 Month Average % Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| U.S. Gross National Product (seasonally adjusted) (bil.) (qtly.) | 4,175.6 | 4,447.7 | 6.5% | 4,331.2 | 4,100.8 | 5.6% |
| Total Personal Income (seasonally adjusted) (bil. of dol.) | 3,481.9 | 3,723.2 | 6.9% | 3,600.6 | 3,392.2 | 6.1% |
| Industrial Production Indexes (seasonally adjusted) (1977=100) | 124.2 | 128.8 | 3.7% | 126.5 | 124.9 | 1.3% |
| Total Non-Farm Bus. Expend. on New Plants & Equip. (bil.) (qtly.) | 375.9 | 392.0 | 4.3% | 381.9 | 383.1 | -0.3% |
| Index of Leading Indicators (1967=100) | 178.4 | 191.8 | 7.5% | 184.8 | 173.7 | 6.4% |
| Price Indexes | | | | | | |
| Consumer Price Indexes (not seasonally adjusted) (1967=100) | | | | | | |
| CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) All Items | 327.9 | 340.1 | 3.7% | 333.2 | 326.0 | 2.2% |
| CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Food & Beverages | 309.5 | 325.4 | 5.1% | 318.9 | 313.2 | 1.8% |
| CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Housing | 361.2 | 371.3 | 2.8% | 364.8 | 356.0 | 2.5% |
| CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Transportation | 308.6 | 316.7 | 2.6% | 310.6 | 316.7 | -1.9% |
| CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Medical Care | 432.0 | 461.3 | 6.8% | 448.4 | 417.8 | 7.3% |
| CPI-U (All Urban Consumers) Energy | 380.6 | 380.6 | 0.0% | 358.3 | 408.9 | -12.4% |
| Producer Price Index (not seasonally adjusted) (1967=100) | | | | | | |
| Producer Price Index, All Finished Goods | 288.9 | 296.8 | 2.7% | 291.6 | 292.4 | -0.3% |
| GNP Price Deflator (1982=100) (qtly.) | 114.0 | 117.2 | 2.8% | 115.9 | 113.2 | 2.4% |
| Civilian Employment (seasonally adjusted) | | | | | | |
| Total Civilian Labor Force (mil.) | 118.1 | 119.5 | 1.2% | 118.8 | 116.6 | 2.0% |
| Total Civilian Employment (mil.) | 109.7 | 112.2 | 2.3% | 110.9 | 108.3 | 2.4% |
| Unemployment Rate | 7.1 | 6.1 | -14.1% | 6.7 | 7.1 | -6.1% |
| Construction | | | | | | |
| Total Construction (mil. of dol.) | 21,649.2 | 24,712.0 | 14.1% | 19,883.1 | 18,966.2 | 4.8% |
| Residential | 10,976.3 | 10,986.4 | 0.1% | 9,665.4 | 9,183.7 | 5.2% |
| Nonresidential | 6,760.9 | 8,227.2 | 21.7% | 6,632.2 | 6,442.2 | 3.0% |
| Non-Building | 3,911.4 | 5,498.4 | 40.6% | 3,560.5 | 3,340.4 | 6.6% |
| New Dwelling Units (no.) | 160,846 | 143,985 | -10.5% | 133,265 | 144,321 | -7.7% |
| Interest Rates | | | | | | |
| Short Term (3-month Treasury bill rate) | 6.21 | 5.69 | -8.4% | 5.54 | 6.82 | -18.8% |
| Long Term (30-year Treasury bond yields) | 8.23 | 8.63 | 4.9% | 7.99 | 9.38 | -14.9% |
| Prime Rates Charged by Banks on Short-term Business Loans (ave.) | 8.50 | 8.25 | -2.9% | 7.73 | 9.24 | -16.4% |
| Mortgage Rates (new homes) | 9.74 | 9.05 | -7.1% | -9.29 | 10.34 | -10.2% |

Sources: Business Conditions Digest, U.S. Department of Commerce: U.S. Gross National Product, Total National Personal Income, Industrial Production Indexes, Total Business Expenditures for New Plant and Equipment, Index of Leading Indicators, GNP Price Deflator, National Employment Data, Interest Rates.

F.W. Dodge Report, McGraw-Hill: National Construction Data.

Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce: New Home Mortgage Rates.

Utah Labor Market Report, Utah Department of Employment Security: Consumer Price Indexes, Producer Price Indexes.

**Chase N. Peterson**, *President, University of Utah*
**Ivor E. Bradley**, *Dean, Graduate School of Business*

**BUREAU OF ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH**

**R. Thayne Robson**, Director
**Frank C. Hachman**, Associate Director

graduate school of business bureau of economic and business research university of utah

**STAFF OF THE BUREAU OF ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH**

*Office Staff*

**Mari Lou Wood**, Office Manager
**Cathy Crawford**, Administrative Assistant
**Diane S. Gillam**, Associate Accountant
**Lee Carberry**, Administrative Secretary
**Gaylene Roethel**, Administrative Secretary
**Michael Khuu**

*Research Analysts, Research Assistants and Programmers*

**Jan Crispin**
**Peter Donner**
**Mark Oberg**
**Gary Ricks**
**Austin Sargent**
**James Wood**

*Senior Research Economists*

**Boyd L. Fjeldsted**
**Rodger Weaver**

*Production Staff*

**James B. Peters**, Graphics